Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 08822 01 OF 02 091857Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00
INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W
----------009464 091902Z /47
P 091820Z JUN 78
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0681

S E C R E T SECTION 01 OF 02 GENEVA 08822

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1
TAGS: PARM
SUBJECT: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 221, JUNE 9, 1978
(SALT TWO - 1780)

REFS: A. SALTTWO 1771, B. SALTTWO 1776, C. SALTTWO 1774

SUMMARY. US EXPLORED SOVIETS' PROPOSED FIFTH AGREED STATEMENT EXEMPTING "CURRENT BOMBERS" FROM FRODS REQUIREMENT IN CONNECTION WITH CONVERSION TO CRUISE MISSILE CARRIERS. SMOLIN ARGUED THAT US PROPOSAL WHICH EXEMPTS ONLY B-52 CMCS FROM FRODS WAS ILLOGICAL AND INEQUITABLE. IN RESPONSE TO EARLIER SOVIET QUESTION, US EXPLAINED INCOMPATIBILITY BETWEEN CURRENTLY PLANNED LONG-RANGE CRUISE MISSILES AND EXISTING SRAM ROTARY LAUNCHERS. US ALSO REVIEWED ITS POSITION ON ADVANCE NOTIFICATION. SOVIETS EXPRESSED THEIR VIEW OF FRODS, WHICH APPEARS IDENTICAL WITH US VIEW. END SUMMARY.

1. PEREZ RESPONDED TO SMOLIN'S QUESTION AT MAY 31 DRAFTING GROUP RE INCOMPATIBILITY OF ALCM AND SRAM ROTARY LAUNCHERS (REF A). PEREZ NOTED THAT ALCM PREVIOUSLY
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 08822 01 OF 02 091857Z

BEING DEVELOPED WOULD HAVE FIT SRAM LAUNCHERS; HOWEVER, ALCM CURRENTLY PLANNED FOR DEPLOYMENT WOULD NOT FIT SRAM LAUNCHERS. HENCE, IT IS APPARENT THAT THERE HAS BEEN CHANGE IN US ALCM. HE ALSO NOTED IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO DISCUSS IN SPECIFIC TERMS HYPOTHETICAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS WHICH MIGHT OCCUR IN FUTURE. B-52 CMCS WOULD BE INCLUDED IN 1320 AGGREGATE AND WOULD BE DISTINGUISHABLE

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

FROM OTHER B-52S ON BASIS OF EXTERNALLY OBSERVABLE DIF-
FERENCES.

2. PEREZ ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION OF SOVIET PROPOSAL FOR
FIFTH AGREED STATEMENT TO ART. II.3 WHICH REFERS TO "CUR-
RENT BOMBERS" OF A TYPE EQUIPPED FOR CRUISE MISSILES
RATHER THAN "CURRENT HEAVY BOMBERS." WHAT TYPES OF AIR-
PLANES DO SOVIETS CONSIDER AS CURRENT BOMBERS, ONLY THOSE
LISTED IN II.3(A) OR OTHERS? SMOLIN REPLIED THAT SOVIET
TEXT WAS CLEAR ENOUGH, ESPECIALLY IF STUDIED IN CONJUNC-
TION WITH THEIR PROPOSALS FOR II.3. IF A BOMBER IS EQUIP-
PED WITH LONG-RANGE CRUISE MISSILES, THEN IT BECOMES A
HEAVY BOMBER. PEREZ NOTED, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT JDT CONTAINS
DEFINITIVE LIST OF CURRENT ICBMS AND SLBMS EQUIPPED WITH
MIRVS AS WELL AS CURRENT HEAVY BOMBERS. HOW WOULD SIDES
DETERMINE WHAT CURRENT "BOMBER" TYPES ARE? SMOLIN REPLIED
THAT NO LIST OF CURRENT BOMBERS WAS REQUIRED. A SIDE CAN
EITHER BUILD SPECIAL TYPE OF BOMBER FOR CRUISE MISSILES
OR TAKE AN EXISTING BOMBER AND EQUIP IT FOR THEM. IN ANY
CASE, THAT TYPE OF ARM WOULD BE SUBJECT TO TREATY PROVI-
SIONS AFTER IT HAS BEEN EQUIPPED FOR CRUISE MISSILES.

3. GRAHAM ASKED WHETHER FIFTH AGREED STATEMENT WOULD
EXEMPT ALL EXISTING BOMBERS AND NOT JUST EXISTING HEAVY
BOMBERS FROM FRODS RULE IN SECOND/THIRD AGREED STATEMENT.
SMOLIN CONFIRMED THIS, ADDING THAT SIDES ARE AGREED OR
SECRET

SECRET

CLOSE TO AGREEMENT ON TYPE RULE BASED ON FRODS. FUTURE
BOMBERS EQUIPPED FOR LONG-RANGE ALCMS MUST HAVE FRODS TO
DISTINGUISH THEM FROM OTHER BOMBERS. HOWEVER, US SAYS
EXISTING TYPE OF BOMBER TO BE USED AS CMC IS ALREADY DE-
VELOPED AND AN EXEMPTION SHOULD BE MADE FOR IT. AFTER
STUDYING US POSITION, SOVIETS INTRODUCED ITS FIFTH AS,
WHICH FORMULATES SUCH AN EXEMPTION FOR ALL EXISTING
BOMBERS (NOT LIMITED ONLY TO HEAVY BOMBERS). THIS EXEMP-
TION HAS BOTH LOGIC AND EQUALITY IN IT. SOVIETS CANNOT
AGREE TO APPROACH IN WHICH AN EXEMPTION MADE FOR AIRPLANES
OR BOMBERS OF ONE SIDE ON GROUND THAT THEY ALREADY EXIST
AND THAT FRODS ARE NOT NECESSARY, WHILE DENYING EQUAL
BENEFITS FOR OTHER SIDE. SOVIET-PROPOSED EXEMPTION WOULD
EXTEND TO ALL BOMBERS REFERRED TO IN ARTS. II.3 AND VIII,
WHICH MUST BE VIEWED IN COMBINATION.

4. GRAHAM POINTED OUT THAT UNDER SOVIET PROPOSAL LARGE
NUMBER OF EXISTING BOMBERS OF DIFFERENT TYPES COULD BE
CONVERTED TO CMCS, WITHOUT APPLICATION OF FROD RULE.
SMOLIN INDICATED THAT, AS PRACTICAL MATTER, NEITHER SIDE
WOULD WISH TO HAVE LARGE NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF
CMCS. HE COMMENTED INFORMALLY LATER THAT EACH SIDE

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

LIKELY WOULD ONLY CONVERT ONE EXISTING BOMBER TO CMC AND THAT A SIDE SHOULD HAVE RIGHT TO CONVERT EXISTING MEDIUM BOMBER FOR THAT PURPOSE. FROD RULE SHOULD NOT APPLY TO ANY EXISTING BOMBER TYPE TO BE USED AS CMC BECAUSE IT WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT TO BUILD FRODS INTO EXISTING BOMBERS.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 08822 02 OF 02 091900Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00
INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W
----------009456 091905Z /41
P 091820Z JUN 78
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0682

S E C R E T SECTION 02 OF 02 GENEVA 08822

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

5. SMOLIN NOTED THAT SOVIET SIDE HAS STATED ITS INTENTION TO REMOVE MYASISHCHEV HEAVY BOMBERS FROM ACTIVE INVENTORY IF TREATY CONCLUDED. THESE BOMBERS, THEREFORE, WILL NOT BE EQUIPPED WITH CRUISE MISSILES. B-52 EXEMPTION FROM FROD RULE IS FULLY COVERED BY SOVIET PROPOSAL, WHICH REPRESENTS POINT OF CONTACT BETWEEN SIDES, IF NOT POINT OF AGREEMENT. IN RESPONSE TO PEREZ QUESTION, SMOLIN CONFIRMED THAT SOVIET PROPOSAL FOR FIFTH AS REFERS TO BOMBERS OF A CURRENT TYPE, AND NOT TO CURRENT BOMBERS ONLY, SO THAT SIDE COULD PRODUCE NEW BOMBERS OF EXISTING TYPES, WHICH WOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO FROD RULE. IF US FINDS LANGUAGE OF FIFTH AS UNCLEAR, SOVIET SIDE PREPARED TO MAKE IT MORE PRECISE BUT WOULD RATHER DO THAT IN PROCESS OF WORKING OUT JOINT FORMULATION.

6. PEREZ EMPHASIZED THAT US PROPOSAL WOULD MAKE ONLY ONE EXEMPTION FROM THE FROD RULE, FOR AN EXISTING HEAVY BOMBER. SOVIET PROPOSAL SEEMED OPEN ENDED. THIS WOULD UNDERMINE WHAT SIDES ARETRYING TO DO VIA TYPE RULE AND ESTABLISHMENT OF FROD RULE. SMOLIN RETORTED THAT US SHOULD

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

EXPLAIN WHY IT ASKED FOR EXEMPTION ONLY FOR ITSELF AND NOT FOR SOVIETS. WHAT ABOUT RECIPROCITY? PEREZ POINTED TO
SECRET

SECRET

THIRD AS WHICH CONTAINS TWO EXEMPTIONS, ONE FOR SOVIETS AND ONE FOR US. SMOLIN CONTENDED THAT QUESTION OF TU-142 HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH CMCS.

7. PEREZ REVIEWED US PRESENTATION ON ADVANCE NOTIFICATION FROM JUNE 8 PLENARY (REF B) NOTING THAT REMAINING DIFFERENCES ON THIS ISSUE WERE SELF-EVIDENT. IF SOVIETS ACCOMODATED US DESIDERATA IN RESOLVING ISSUES, THEY COULD ASSUME US WOULD BE EQUALLY FORTHCOMING. SMOLIN PROBED US WILLINGNESS TO COMPROMISE AND AGREED TO STUDY US CONSIDERATIONS.

8. SMOLIN REFERRED TO US QUESTION OF JUNE 6 (REF C) WHETHER DIFFERENCES EXISTED BETWEEN US AND SOVIET UNDERSTANDING OF FRODS. HE THEN READ STATEMENT IDENTICAL WITH US PROPOSED COMMON UNDERSTANDING ON FRODS EXCEPT FOR SUBSTITUTION OF "BOMBER" FOR "AIRPLANE" AND ADDITION OF PHRASE EXTENDING CONCEPT TO ASBM CARRIERS.

9. SOVIETS INTRODUCED REVISED VERSION OF ART. VI.5, IDENTICAL TO US PROPOSAL EXCEPT THAT LIMITATION WOULD BEGIN "AFTER" RATHER THAN "WHEN" HEAVY BOMBER BROUGHT OUT OF SHOP, ETC. GRAHAM COMMENTED THAT US VIEW WAS THAT "WHEN" IS APPROPRIATE IN SPEAKING OF CONVERSION, AS IN PARAS 3 AND 4 OF VI AND "AFTER" IS APPRDPRIATE FOR ARMS IN FINAL STAGE OF CONSTRUCTION, AS IN PARA 2. SMOLIN SAID SOVIETS WOULD STUDY THIS AND RETURN TO QUESTION LATER.

10. SMOLIN NOTED THAT SIDES AGREED SOME BOMBERS WILL HAVE FRODS AND SOME ONLY OBSERVABLE DIFFERENCES AS RESULT OF CONVERSION TO CMCS. IT IS NOT CLEAR, HOWEVER, HOW FRODS CONCEPT WILL APPLY TO REVERSE PROCESS, IN WHICH THESE AIRPLANES WOULD BE REMOVED FROM AGGREGATES. IF ONLY ODS
SECRET

SECRET

WERE SUFFICIENT FOR CONVERSION TO CMC, WOULD SAME BE ACCEPTABLE FOR RECONVERSION OR WOULD FRODS BE NECESSARY. US SAID IT WOULD CONSIDER QUESTION.

11. NEXT MEETING, TUESDAY, JUNE 13. EARLE

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

SECRET

NNN

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MEETINGS, SALT (ARMS CONTROL)
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 09 jun 1978
Decaption Date: 20 Mar 2014
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978GENEVA08822
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780242-0256
Format: TEL
From: GENEVA USSALTTWO
Handling Restrictions:
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780678/aaaacopl.tel
Line Count: 222
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 26e5c58c-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: 78 SALT TALKS 1771, 78 SALT TALKS 1776, 78 SALT TALKS 1774
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 01 aug 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2421438
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 221, JUNE 9, 1978 (SALT TWO - 1780)
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE
Type: TE
vdkvgwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/26e5c58c-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014